



# AF/3761  
IFW

## In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Appellants:

Ronald L. Edens; James J. Hlaban,  
Laura J. Keely; Thomas P. Keenan,  
Sylvia B. Little; Mary L. McDaniel;  
Stephen L. Nunn; William G.  
Reeves; Heather A. Sorebo; Susan  
M. Weyenberg

Docket No.: 17696

Serial No.: 10/037,276

Group: 3761

Filed: December 31, 2001

Examiner: Kidwell, Michele M

For: LABIAL PAD

Date: July 8, 2004

### Appeal Brief Transmittal Letter

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.192, transmitted herewith in triplicate is an Appeal Brief pursuant to the Notice of Appeal which was mailed on June 22, 2004.

Please charge the \$330.00 fee, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.17(c), which is due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc. deposit account number 11-0875. This Appeal Brief Transmittal Letter is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

RONALD L. EDENS ET AL.

By: 

Paul Y. Yee

Registration No.: 29,460

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, Judith M. Anderson, hereby certify that on July 8, 2004 this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By: 

Judith M. Anderson



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Ronald L. Edens et al.

Examiner: Kidwell, Michele M.

Serial No.: 10/037,276

Art Unit: 3761

Confirmation No.: 6825

Filed: December 31, 2001

Docket No.: 17,696

For: LABIAL PAD

Date: July 8, 2004

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is filed in response to the Final Rejection dated 05/03/2004 for the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal was filed June 22, 2004.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc., the assignee of all rights to the invention of the above-identified application.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

To the knowledge of appellants, appellants' legal representative, or assignee, there are no other known related appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

07/14/2004 AWONDAF1 00000056 110875 10037276

01 FC:1402 330.00 DA

### STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-18 and 22-35 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-18 and 22-35 are under appeal.

### STATUS OF AMENDMENTS FILED SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL REJECTION

No amendments were filed subsequent to the Final Rejection.

### SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Generally stated, the present invention provides an absorbent article having a fluid permeable cover, a liquid impermeable baffle and an absorbent. The absorbent is desirably situated between the cover and the baffle. The absorbent article has a principal longitudinal axis and a principal transverse axis, and is configured to provide a labial pad for disposition within the vestibule of a female wearer. The absorbent has a length, a widest portion, a width at the widest portion, a narrowest portion, a width at the narrowest portion, and a thickness. The absorbent also has first and second end regions and a central region disposed between the first and second end regions. In addition, the absorbent includes first and second spaced apart longitudinal sides, and first and second spaced apart transverse ends. The longitudinal sides together with the transverse ends generally form the periphery of the absorbent, and the widest portion of the absorbent is not situated in the central region. In a particular aspect, the absorbent can have a maximum length, and a minimum length that lies generally along the principal longitudinal axis and is less than the maximum longitudinal length. In other aspects, the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region, a narrowest portion of the absorbent has a narrowest width situated in the central region of the absorbent, a second widest portion of the absorbent has a second widest width situated in the second end region of the absorbent, and the width of the narrowest portion is smaller than the width of the second widest portion.

Particular descriptions of the absorbent article of the invention can, for example, be found in the original specification at page 2, lines 17 - 27. Particular descriptions of the upper, bodyside surface and the lower surface of the absorbent and other components are, for example, found at page 5, lines 15-31. Particular descriptions of the transverse ends, the maximum length, and the minimum length can, for example, be found at page 7, lines 8-29. Additional disclosures of the transverse ends, the maximum length, and the minimum length are found in FIGs. 7 and 10.

Further aspects and features of the invention are set forth in the specification and claims. For example, with regard to claims 3, 11, 18 and 29, an article having an absorbent with a minimum width in the central region of the absorbent is disclosed at page 6, lines 27-30 and in original FIG. 10.

In its various aspects and features, the article of the claimed invention can provide a labial pad that can be more effectively positioned and held between the labia majora of the wearer. The article can be more conveniently grasped for placement on the wearer, and can more effectively allow an individualized positioning to provide a customized fit adjustment.

#### STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

##### Issue 1

Whether claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-17, 27-28 and 31-35 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al.

##### Issue 2

Whether claims 3-4, 11-12, 18, 22-26 and 29-30 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al.

#### GROUPING OF CLAIMS FOR EACH GROUND OF REJECTION

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-17, 27-28 and 31-35 have been alleged to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al.

Claims 3-4, 11-12, 18, 22-26 and 29-30 have been alleged to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al.

With regard to the following groups of claims, the claims within each group stand or fall together:

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-17, 22-28 and 30-35.

Claims 3, 11, 18 and 29.

In all other respects, it is submitted that the claims do not stand or fall together.

## ARGUMENTS FOR REVERSAL

### The claims on appeal

Claims 1-18 and 22-35 are on appeal, and are set forth in the enclosed APPENDIX 1.

### Prior art relied on by the examiner

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner has relied on the following art:

U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al.

### Arguments

For the reasons set forth below, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection should be reversed. It is also respectfully submitted that, for the reasons set forth below, the claims do not stand or fall together.

### Issue 1

Claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-17, 27-28 and 31-35 have been alleged to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al. (hereinafter McFall).

The rejection is respectfully **traversed** to the extent that it may apply to the currently presented claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are not proper, and that the teachings of the cited references do not anticipate a structure having the combination of elements called for by Appellants' claimed invention.

Anticipation requires that every element of the claim be described in a single prior art reference, see *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 1326, 231 USPQ 136, 138 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Studiengesellschaft Kohle, MBH v. Dart Ind.*, 726 F. 2d 724, 726-27, 220 USPQ 841, 842 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Additionally, the single prior art reference must disclose all of the claim elements in the combination called for by the presented claim.

It is respectfully submitted that McFall fails to anticipate the claimed invention. McFall describes an absorbent device that is insertable into the interlabial space of a female wearer for catamenial purposes, incontinence protection, or both. The absorbent interlabial device has at least a body-contacting surface and a backsheet having an integral protrusion formed therein of sufficient dimensions to aid in insertion into the interlabial space. Examples of shapes for the

main body portion of the device include ovoid, elliptical, trapezoidal, rectangular, triangular, diamond-shaped, or any combination of the above.

McFall, however, does not disclose or suggest an absorbent labial pad having the configurations called for by Appellants' presented claims. In particular, McFall does not teach a labial pad in which an absorbent has a maximum length extending from a first transverse end (76) to a spaced apart second transverse end (78), and at least a body-facing surface of the absorbent has a minimum length that extends generally along the principal longitudinal axis from the first transverse end to the second transverse end and is less than the maximum longitudinal length, as called for by the claimed invention. Neither does McFall teach a labial pad configuration in which the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region, a narrowest portion of the absorbent has a narrowest width situated in the central region of the absorbent, a second widest portion of the absorbent has a second widest width situated in the second end region of the absorbent, and the width of the narrowest portion is smaller than the width of the second widest portion, as called for by Appellants' presented claims.

In the Office communication dated 05/03/2004, the Examiner purports to present a drawing which allegedly shows how McFall discloses the minimum length called for by the claimed invention. It is submitted that the drawing derived from McFall fails to teach the invention called for by the presented claims. To the extent discernible by Appellants' attorney, the "Minimum longitudinal length" identified on the drawing does not represent a length that extends from the first transverse end to the second transverse end of the absorbent. To the extent that there is an intent to identify another longitudinal length that differs from the "Maximum longitudinal length" identified on the drawing, it is submitted that such length dimension is not a "minimum length" of the absorbent, as called for by the claimed invention. Moreover, to the extent that the longitudinal length of the absorbent in the drawing reaches its minimum, such minimum occurs at the widest part of the absorbent at a location that is significantly spaced-away from the principal longitudinal axis.

As a result, when compared to Appellants' claimed invention, the structures taught by McFall would be less able to be effectively positioned and held between the labia majora of the wearer. The configurations taught McFall would be less conveniently grasped for interlabial placement on the wearer, and would less effectively provide a desired, customized fit adjustment. It is, therefore, readily apparent that McFall does not disclose or suggest Appellants' claimed invention.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be reversed.

## Issue 2

Claims 3-4, 11-12, 18, 22-26 and 29-30 have been alleged to be unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,432,096 (McFall).

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are not proper, and that the teachings of the cited references do not render obvious a structure having the combination of elements called for by Appellants' claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not established "*prima facie*" that a proper combination of the cited references would disclose or suggest Appellants' claimed invention.

It is well accepted that, as a minimum, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must contain the following elements:

- 1) there must be a basis in the reference for a modification;
- 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success -- obvious to "try" is not the standard; and
- 3) the prior art must render obvious the invention as a whole.

In addition, it is not appropriate to engage in hindsight. It is inappropriate to pick and choose isolated elements from various prior art references and combine them so as to yield the invention in question when such combining would not have been an obvious thing to do at the time in question. *Panduit Corporation v. Dennison Manufacturing Company*, 227 USPQ 337 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d at 902, 221 USPQ at 1127. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783-1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. *In re Gorman*, 933 Fed. 2d 982, 987. 18 USPQ 2d 1885, 1888 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780 at 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). One cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art to deprecate the claimed invention. *In re Fine*, 837 Fed. 2d at 1075, 5 USPQ 2d at 1600. *In re Fritch*, 23 USPQ 2d 1780 at 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Where the cited references do not teach how to make the particular combinations needed

to arrive at the invention called for by Appellants' claims, the claimed invention cannot be deemed "obvious". Ex parte Levengood, 1993.

It is also well established that a prior art reference must be evaluated as an entirety and that the prior art must be evaluated as a whole. W.L. Gore and Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Where neither any reference considered in its entirety, nor the prior art as a whole, suggests the combination claimed, the invention is non-obvious. Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate, Inc., 225 USPQ 26 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

In the present application, however, the cited references, when considered in their entirety, do not disclose or suggest the combination asserted by the Examiner. If anything, the references suggest that the combination asserted by the Examiner would be contrary to the desires and expectations of the person of ordinary skill. A proper consideration of the cited references would provide only an expectation that the article of the present invention would be unsuitable. To a person of ordinary skill, the cited references would teach away from even trying the invention called for by Appellants' claims. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that McFall provides no motivation to make the modifications needed to synthesize the invention called for by the presented Claims 3-4, 11-12, 18, 22-26 and 29-30. Moreover, McFall provides even less motivation to synthesize the invention called for by Claims 3, 11, 18 and 29.

As an initial matter it is submitted that, McFall fails to teach a labial pad in which an absorbent has a maximum length extending from a first transverse end (76) to a spaced apart second transverse end (78), and at least a body-facing surface of the absorbent has a minimum length that extends generally along the principal longitudinal axis from the first transverse end to the second transverse end, as called for by the claimed invention. Furthermore, McFall provides no motivation to make the further changes and modifications needed to synthesize a configuration of the absorbent that incorporates the minimum length called for by the presented claims.

The Examiner has asserted that McFall discloses that the main body portion of the article can be any "suitable" configuration, as set forth in McFall at col. 5, lines 29-30. It is submitted, however, that McFall does not disclose or suggest that a dog bone or hourglass shape would be a "suitable" configuration for a labial pad. Even if one assumes for the purposes of argument that a dog bone or hourglass shaped configuration is well known in the art and that either configuration is "routinely" used to provide articles that better conform to the wearer's anatomy, it is pointed out that in the prior art, the dog bone or hourglass shapes have been "routinely"



employed in conventional sanitary napkins, but have not been deemed suitable for incorporation into the labial pad configurations called for by the presented claims. While the dog bone and hourglass shapes of such conventional sanitary napkins have been configured to conform to parts of the female anatomy, the crotch region of the anatomy encountered by a sanitary napkin would significantly differ from the interlabial parts of the female anatomy encountered by a labial pad. Indeed, McFall at Fig. 6 and at column 22, lines 22-61 teaches that the shape of the sanitary napkin is particularly suited to fit a different portion of the anatomy, and operates as a different part of the overall "system". Moreover, the folding of the labial pad prior to disposition within the vestibule of the wearer would be adverse and contrary to any "conformance" objective taught with respect to a sanitary napkin. When the disclosure of McFall is taken in its entirety, as a whole, it is readily apparent that McFall has separated and differentiated the sanitary napkin portion of the "system". As taught by McFall, a person of ordinary skill would understand that the features that pertain to the sanitary napkin serve a different purpose and would not pertain to the labial pad portion of the system.

Thus, it is readily apparent that the Examiner has not established *prima facie* that the claimed invention would be unpatentable over McFall under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). To the contrary, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has engaged in impermissible "hindsight", and has employed Appellants' disclosure as an instruction guide for picking and choosing particular elements from a universe of possible features. In the absence of Appellants' disclosure, the teachings of McFall would not lead a skilled person to the modifications needed to synthesize the configurations of the claimed invention, and the required changes would remain unapparent and unobvious. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Appellants' claimed invention is patentable over McFall.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be reversed.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 based upon U.S. Patent 6,432,096 to McFall, et al. should be reversed. It is respectfully submitted that Appellants' claimed invention is neither expressly taught by nor inherent in the cited reference. Furthermore, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case that the particular combinations of components called for by Appellants' claims would be suggested by a proper consideration of the cited reference. To the contrary, it is readily apparent that when the cited reference is considered

in its entirety and the reference is taken as a whole, a proper consideration of the cited reference would teach away from Appellants' claimed invention. Only in light of Appellants' present disclosure and the impermissible use of hindsight would a person of ordinary skill be directed to the significant changes and modifications needed to reconfigure the various components to arrive at Appellants' claimed invention. It is, therefore, readily apparent that the invention called for by Appellants' presented claims is patentable over the cited reference.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-18 and 22-35 are in allowable condition, and that the Examiner's rejections should be **reversed**.

Please charge any prosecution fee(s) which may be required for this paper to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc., Deposit Account No. 11-0875.

Respectfully submitted,

RONALD L. EDENS, ET AL.

By: 

Paul Yee  
Registration No. 29,460  
Attorney for Appellants

KIMBERLY-CLARK WORLDWIDE, INC.  
401 North Lake Street  
Neenah, Wisconsin 54956  
Telephone: 920-721-2435

Enclosure

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I, Judith M. Anderson, hereby certify that on July 8, 2004 this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

By:   
Judith M. Anderson

## **APPENDIX 1**

1. An absorbent article (40) comprising a fluid permeable cover (62), a liquid impermeable baffle (64) and an absorbent (66) situated between the cover and the baffle, the absorbent article having a principal longitudinal axis and a principal transverse axis, and being configured to provide a labial pad for disposition within the vestibule of a female wearer, the absorbent having a maximum longitudinal length of no greater than about 100 mm extending from a first transverse end (76) to a spaced apart second transverse end (78), a body-facing surface of the absorbent having a minimum longitudinal length ( $L_{min}$ ) that lies generally along said principal longitudinal axis from said first transverse end area to said second transverse end area and is less than said maximum longitudinal length, a maximum width of no greater than about 70 mm, a widest portion, a width at the widest portion, a narrowest portion, a width at the narrowest portion which is smaller than said width at the widest portion, a maximum thickness of no greater than about 10 mm, first (70) and second (72) end regions and a central region (74) disposed between the first and second end regions, and first (80) and second (82) spaced apart longitudinal sides, the longitudinal sides together with the transverse ends generally forming the periphery of the absorbent, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is not situated in the central region, and the article is to be folded parallel to said longitudinal axis prior to disposition within the vestibule of the wearer.

2. The absorbent article of claim 1, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region.

3. The absorbent article of claim 2, wherein the narrowest portion of the absorbent is situated in said central region of the absorbent; a second widest portion of the absorbent has a width and is situated in the second end region of the absorbent, and said width at the narrowest portion is smaller than said width of said second widest portion of the absorbent.

4. The absorbent article of claim 1, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the second end region.

5. The absorbent article of claim 1, wherein the cover and the baffle have peripheries which are coterminous with the periphery of the absorbent.

6. The absorbent article of claim 1, wherein the cover and the baffle have peripheries which extend outward beyond the periphery of the absorbent.

7. The absorbent article of claim 6, wherein the peripheries of the cover and the baffle are at least partially peripherally joined to form an edge (84).

8. The absorbent article of claim 1, wherein the absorbent further comprises a superabsorbent polymer.

9. An absorbent article (40) comprising an absorbent (66) and a liquid impermeable baffle (64), the absorbent article having a principal longitudinal axis and a principal transverse axis, and being configured to provide a labial pad for disposition within the vestibule of a female wearer, the absorbent having a maximum longitudinal length of no greater than about 100 mm, extending from a first transverse end (76) to a spaced apart second transverse end (78), a body-facing surface of the absorbent having a minimum longitudinal length ( $L_{min}$ ) that lies generally along said principal longitudinal axis from said first transverse end to said second transverse area and is less than said maximum longitudinal length, a maximum width of no greater than about 70 mm, a widest portion, a width at the widest portion, a narrowest portion, a width at the narrowest portion which is smaller than said width at the narrowest portion, a maximum thickness of no greater than about 10 mm, first (70) and second (72) end regions and a central region (74) disposed between the first and second end regions, and first (80) and second (82) spaced apart longitudinal sides, the longitudinal sides together with the transverse ends generally forming the periphery of the absorbent, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is not situated in the central region, and the article is to be folded parallel to said longitudinal axis prior to disposition within the vestibule of the wearer.

10. The absorbent article of claim 9, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region.

11. The absorbent article of claim 10, wherein the narrowest portion of the absorbent is situated in said central region of the absorbent, a second widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the second end region of the absorbent, and said width of the narrowest portion is smaller than said width of the second widest portion.

12. The absorbent article of claim 9, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the second end region.

13. The absorbent article of claim 9, wherein the baffle has a periphery which is coterminous with the periphery of the absorbent.

14. The absorbent article of claim 9, further comprising a fluid permeable cover (62).

15. The absorbent article of claim 14, wherein the cover encloses the absorbent.

16. The absorbent article of claim 13, further comprising a fluid permeable cover (62), the cover having a periphery which is coterminous with the periphery of the absorbent.

17. The absorbent article of claim 9, wherein the absorbent further comprises a superabsorbent polymer.

18. An absorbent article (40) having a longitudinal axis, said article comprising an absorbent (66) configured to provide a labial pad for disposition within the vestibule of a female wearer, a widest portion, a maximum width of no greater than about 70 mm, a maximum thickness of no greater than about 10 mm, first (70) and second (72) end regions and a central region (74) disposed between the first and second end regions, first (80) and second (82) spaced apart longitudinal sides, and first (76) and second (78) spaced apart transverse ends, the longitudinal sides together with the transverse ends generally forming the periphery of the absorbent,

wherein

the absorbent has a maximum longitudinal length of no greater than about 100 mm extending from said first transverse end (76) to said second transverse end (78), a body-facing surface of the absorbent has a minimum longitudinal length ( $L_{min}$ ) that extends generally along said principal longitudinal axis from said first transverse end to said second transverse area and is less than said maximum longitudinal length, the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region, a narrowest portion of the absorbent has a narrowest width situated in the central region of the absorbent, a second widest portion of the absorbent has a second widest width situated in the second end region of the absorbent, the width of the narrowest portion is smaller than the width of the second widest portion, and the article is configured to be folded parallel to said longitudinal axis prior to disposition within the vestibule of the wearer.

19. (canceled)

20. (canceled)

21. (canceled)

22. The absorbent article of claim 18, wherein the absorbent has an upper surface and a fluid permeable cover (62) residing on the upper surface of the absorbent.

23. The absorbent article of claim 18, further comprising a fluid permeable cover (62) surrounding the absorbent.

24. The absorbent article of claim 23, wherein the cover partially encloses the absorbent.

25. The absorbent article of claim 23, wherein the cover entirely encloses the absorbent.

26. The absorbent article of claim 18, wherein the absorbent further comprises a superabsorbent polymer.

27. An absorbent article (40) comprising an absorbent (66) and a fluid permeable cover (62), the absorbent article having a principal longitudinal axis and a principal transverse axis, and being configured to provide a labial pad for disposition within the vestibule of a female wearer, the absorbent having a maximum longitudinal length of no greater than about 100 mm, extending from a first transverse end (76) to a spaced apart second transverse end (78), a body-facing surface of the absorbent having a minimum longitudinal length ( $L_{min}$ ) that lies generally along said principal longitudinal axis from said first transverse end to said second transverse end and is less than said maximum longitudinal length, a maximum width of no greater than about 70 mm, a widest portion, a width at the widest portion, a narrowest portion, a width at the narrowest portion which is smaller than said width at the widest portion, a maximum thickness of no greater than about 10 mm, first (70) and second (72) end regions and a central region (74) disposed between the first and second end regions, and first (80) and second (82) spaced apart longitudinal sides, the longitudinal sides together with the transverse ends generally forming the periphery of the absorbent, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is not situated in the central region, and the article is to be folded parallel to said longitudinal axis prior to disposition within the vestibule of the wearer.

28. The absorbent article of claim 27, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the first end region.

29. The absorbent article of claim 28, wherein the narrowest portion of the absorbent is situated in said central region of the absorbent, a second widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the second end region of the absorbent, and said width of the narrowest portion is smaller than said width of the second widest portion.

30. The absorbent article of claim 27, wherein the widest portion of the absorbent is situated in the second end region.

31. The absorbent article of claim 27, wherein the cover has a periphery which is coterminous with the periphery of the absorbent.
32. The absorbent article of claim 27, further comprising a liquid impermeable baffle (64).
33. The absorbent article of claim 27, wherein the cover encloses the absorbent.
34. The absorbent article of claim 31, further comprising a liquid impermeable baffle (64), the baffle having a periphery which is coterminous with the periphery of the absorbent.
35. The absorbent article of claim 27, wherein the absorbent further comprises a superabsorbent polymer.